DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 475 PS 001 909

By-Hervey, Sarah D.

Attitudes, Expectations, and Behavior of Parents of Head Start and Non-Head Start Children. Report Number 1.

Merrill Palmer Inst., Detroit, Mich.; Michigan State Univ., East Lansing. Head Start Evaluation and Research Center.
Spons Agency-Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C.
Report No-OEO-4118-R-1
Pub Date Aug 68
Note-24p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.30
Descriptors-*Child Rearing, *Compensatory Education Programs, Culturally Disadvantaged, Low Income Groups, Negroes, Parental Aspiration, *Parent Attitudes, Parent Child Relationship, Parent Influence, *Parent Participation, *Program Effectiveness, Questionnaires
Identifiers-*Head Start, Merrill Palmer Head Start Questionnaire

Head Start was conceived not only as an intervention program with children, but as a total effort of intervention in the disadvantaged family. Head Start seeks to influence the child not only directly through the classroom program, but indirectly through the parents. It is, therefore, important to determine if parent participation in Head Start modifies their attitudes and behavior in a way relevant to the positive development of their children. In order to ascertain if such a change takes place, Head Start parents were compared with non-Head Start parents as to educational and child rearing practices. The data was obtained by administering the Merrill-Palmer Head Start questionnaire to 103 Head Start parents and 77 non-Head Start parents. Both samples were Negro and comparable on income level and family size. Very few behavior and attitudinal differences between the two groups of parents were found. Those few differences were meaningful only individually and did not follow any pattern. These findings fail to support the assumption that Head Start experience will change the parents and thereby influence the child. (WD)

EDO 30475

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

F-OEO
OEO-4118-Report #1

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Research Papers of the

Head Start Evaluation and Research Center

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF HOME ECONOMICS
in cooperation with
MERRILL-PALMER INSTITUTE

Report Number
1

Attitudes, Expectations, and Behavior of Parents of Head Start and Non-Head Start Children

Sarah D. Hervey
The Merrill-Palmer Institute

PS 001909

Robert P. Boger, Center Director, Michigan State University
in cooperation with Irving Sigel, Merrill-Palmer Institute
Sarah D. Hervey, Associate Director for Research
Marilyn W. Story, Associate Director for Evaluation

August, 1968

The research reported herein was supported by a subcontract with Michigan State University through its contract OEO 4118 with the Office of Economic Opportunity for establishment of a Head Start Evaluation and Research Center.

Supported by
OEO Contract 4118 with the
Office of Economic Opportunity

Abstract

ATTITUDES, EXPECTATIONS, AND BEHAVIOR OF PARENTS OF HEAD START AND NON-HEAD START CHILDREN

Sarah D. Hervey
The Merrill-Palmer Institute
July 1, 1968

From its original planning stages Head Start was conceived not merely a program for the child alone, but as a total-family intervention. Head Start's direct influence on the child has been evaluated carefully since the first summer Head Start was in operation, but the influence of the program upon parents has been the subject of only peripheral interest. Since Head Start seeks to influence the child not only directly through the classroom program but indirectly through the parents as well, it would seem appropriate to investigate the effects of Head Start participation upon parents by comparing them with similar parents of similar children who had not been enrolled in Head Start, with a particular focus upon those attitudes and behaviors which relate to the parent's childrearing practices. Four areas were investigated: punishment severity, obedience expectations, attitudes toward childrearing, and influence techniques.

The sample for the study was composed of parents (all mothers and as many fathers as were living in the home) of Negro upper-lower and lower-lower class kindergarten children in inner city schools. Fifty eight mothers and 45 fathers of children who had been enrolled in Head Start were interviewed; 49 mothers and 28 fathers of non-Head Start children were interviewed.

It was found that very few behavior and attitudinal differences between parents of kindergarten children who had participated in Head

Start and parents of similar children with no preschool experience could be defined. The few differences that were found were meaningful individually, but did not seem to follow any pattern. The significance of these results for Head Start was discussed, and two conclusions were drawn. First, it seemed clear that Head Start is making only part of the impact on the children that it could be making. The direct influence on the child, through classes, bears the major burden, because the potential for an indirect influence through the parents is not being realized. And second, since the parents supposedly benefit from Head Start personally as well as through the child, apparently the parents as well as the children are missing many of the benefits that Head Start might provide them.

ATTITUDES, EXPECTATIONS, AND BEHAVIOR OF PARENTS OF HEAD START AND NON-HEAD START CHILDREN

Problem

Head Start was conceived not only as an intervention program with children, but as a total effort of intervention in the disadvantaged family. The goals of Head Start apply not to the child in isolation, but to the child as he is a part of a family; Head Start seeks to influence the child not only directly through classes but also indirectly through its influence on the family.

Head Start's direct influence on the child has been the subject of careful examination since the first Head Start programs were instituted in 1965. However, the program's influence on parents has not received parallel attention. In the summer 1966 and full-year 1966-67 national Head Start evaluations, parents of the sample children were interviewed at the close of the Head Start program, but no attempt was made to determine whether the parents' behaviors or attitudes had been influenced by the Head Start program. No conclusions could be made from these studies about the influence of Head Start on the family since the family's status before Head Start could not be ascertained. And, therefore, the indirect influence on children was not ascertainable. The 1967-1968 full-year evaluation improved upon this model by including a parent interview conducted pre and post, and it is likely that some information will be available on changes during the 8-month Head Start program.

These past evaluation models have focused upon the treatment group -- the Head Start parents. No studies of Head Start's influence on parents

have yielded information on differences between parents whose children and families have participated in Head Start and those who have not. Kitano in investigating the effects of parent participation in Head Start on parents and children has developed a scale to measure alienation and has proposed to use it in studying changes in alienation in Head Start parents; he also has examined Head Start parents' use of community resources.(1) However, neither of these studies was directly addressed to the issue of differences between Head Start and non Head Start families in areas relevant to the development of their children. Bell has investigated patterns of childrearing exhibited by mothers of Head Start children, but his focus was not on comparing these mothers with a control group.(2)

It was the purpose of this study to investigate the effects of Head Start participation on parents by comparing them with similar parents of similar children who had not participated in Head Start. Specifically, the Head Start experience could be expected to influence parents in some areas more than in others. Head Start has generally focused considerable attention on education, for example, and it would be expected that contact with a Head Start program would elicit certain educational attitudes and behaviors. Another common focus in the parent education component of Head Start is an emphasis on child development principles -- for example, child-rearing behavior. It is in such areas as these that hypotheses could be made regarding the influence of Head Start upon parents.

---

(1) The annual report of the Head Start Research and Evaluation Office, Carolyn Stern, director, The University of California at Los Angeles, November, 1967.

(2) A Digest of the Research Activities of Regional Evaluation and Research Centers for Project Head Start: 1966-1967. The Institute for Educational Development, January 15, 1968.

Education. -- If Head Start exposure is influential upon the parent's outlook on education, or upon education-related behaviors, it may be hypothesized that Head Start parents would respond differently than would non-Head Start parents to questions regarding their behavior and attitudes in these areas. Some of the areas in which this hypothesis was raised are:

1. Assumption of financial responsibility for child's education
2. Willingness to sacrifice for the child to attain a desired educational level
3. Assumption of responsibility for, and behavior in, teaching the child
4. Technique for handling child's apprehensions about school

These variables are indicators of the parents' very general attitude toward and behavior in situations related to education. However more specific educational attitudes should also be examined. For example, if the Head Start experience is successful, it should raise the parents' aspirations for their children from the limited view of lower-class potential to higher possibilities. Specifically, the following areas of parental aspiration and expectation for their children were defined to test this hypothesis:

1. Educational aspirations and expectations
2. Occupational aspirations and expectations
3. Income aspirations and expectations

Childrearing patterns. -- The second emphasis of Head Start parent involvement, after the focus on educational values and attitudes, is the parent's understanding of and behavior with his child. Parent programs often focus upon changing those characteristics of lower class family interaction having a negative influence on the child -- for example,

harsh punishment. An effort is made to change parents' expectations and behaviors such as these; sometimes this attempt is viewed as an effort to bring the parents to a middle-class orientation. If this change is achieved, it would be expected that the Head Start parents would exhibit more "acceptable" (or middle-class) behaviors and attitudes. Specifically, the following hypotheses would be made about Head Start parents in comparison with similar lower class parents unexposed to Head Start:

1. Less severe punishing
2. Less rigid obedience expectations
3. Attitudes toward childrearing more similar to middle-class attitudes
4. More likely to qualify their influence-control techniques with reason, i.e. less likely to punish without explanation

In summary, this study was built upon the general basic assumption that Head Start programs do influence parents as well as children, that the influence upon parents is in the direction of positive educational and childrearing attitudes and behaviors, and that these attitudes and behaviors may be measured. The study hypothesized that Head Start parents would in general demonstrate more positive attitudes and behaviors than would similar parents of similar children who had not participated in Head Start.

Procedures

Sample

The Merrill-Palmer Head Start questionnaire (developed in 1967) was administered to both parents of children who were involved in another Merrill-Palmer research study.[3] The sample for the present study

---

3 See the final report of the Head Start Evaluation and Research Center, 1966-1967, Volume II, Michigan State University and Merrill-Palmer Institute.

consisted of mothers and as many fathers as were present in the family of lower-class Negro kindergarten children in several inner city Detroit public schools. The particular kindergarten classes defined for the study were selected on the basis of having teachers and principals receptive to research, a criterion judged not to have a biasing effect on the present study. "Lower class" was defined using Hollingshead's model for determining socioeconomic class by combining education and occupation classifications; classes 4 and 5 of the five-category model were used for this study.[4]

The sample of parents was distributed thusly:

TABLE 1: Sample

Head Start experience of child	Socioeconomic Class			
	4: Upper-Lower		5: Lower-Lower	
	Mothers	Fathers	Mothers	Fathers
Head Start	21	19	37	26
No preschool experience	17	11	32	17

The two groups' comparability was established by several criteria: (a) socioeconomic level according to Hollingshead's model; (b) selection of sample from "neighborhood schools," i.e. the Head Start and control families sampled lived in the same neighborhoods; and (c) conformation with the OEO guidelines for Head Start eligibility. Since the Head Start eligibility guidelines specify maximum income levels for families of various sizes, similarity of incomes and family size would ensure

4 August B. Hollingshead, Two Factor Index of Social Position (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957).

PS 001909

comparable status with respect to the OEO Head Start eligibility (or "poverty level") guidelines. The distributions of income levels and of family size are described in Tables 2 and 3 respectively.

TABLE 2: Income From Employment: Head Start and non-Head Start Parents*

	Annual Income							
	Fathers				Mothers			
	Under $3000.	3000-5000.	5000-7000.	Over 7000.	Under $3000.	3000-5000.	5000-7000.	Over 7000.
Head Start	8	6	15	9	33	13	5	3
Non Head Start	5	4	13	11	30	7	5	2

* N's are smaller than the total sample because income from sources other than employment (e.g. from A.D.C.) is not reflected in this table.

TABLE 3: Mean Number of Persons in Head Start and non-Head Start Children's Households According to Mother

	Socioeconomic Level	
	4	5
Head Start	7.4286	7.5135
Non-Head Start	7.7059	7.2188

The questionnaire was administered by trained interviewers at the interviewees' homes. The entire interview lasted 1 to 2 hours; only portions of the total questionnaire were used in the present study.

Instrumentation -- The Merrill-Palmer interview questions used to tap the variables discussed above, and the systems used to code the responses, are presented in the Appendix.

Analysis

Analytic techniques varied because of the variety in response types. Three types of responses predominated: (1) free-response items, which were classified by coders into discrete categories without any assumption of hierarchy, (2) rating responses, in which the interviewees selected a response to reflect their agreement, happiness, or other ordinal rating for the item, and (3) numerical responses, in which the interviewee responded with an integer (e.g. number of years of schooling). The analysis technique used for data of type one was the chi-square test of independence in cases where more than two categories were observed, and t-test of the differences in proportions where two categories were sufficient for the data and the item could meaningfully be viewed in terms of proportions. Chi-square tests were also used for data of type two. Type three data were analyzed with t-tests for means of independent samples. In all cases the interpretations were directional; that is, one-tail t-tests were used, and the chi-square analyses were interpreted as confirming the hypotheses only if the distributions showed directions as hypothesized.

Results

Demographic characteristics

The two samples were determined to be comparable, as was seen in Tables 2 and 3. Other demographic characteristics of the two samples were also examined, and no significant differences between the two groups were found, as shown in Table 4.

TABLE 4: Demographic Differences Between Head Start and non-Head Start Parents

	Head Start	non-Head Start
Proportion of intact families	P≤.608	P≤.535
Education of father		
elem. school	P≤.12	P≤.10
junior high	.26	.27
some senior high	.34	.39
high school grad.	.26	.24
Education of mother		
elem. school	P≤.9	P≤.4
junior high	.24	.18
some senior high	.50	.45
high school grad.	.16	.31
Proportion of fathers employed	P≤.824	P≤.907
Proportion of mothers employed	P≤.414	P≤.347
Occupational level of father*		
administrative or minor professional	P≤.00	P≤.02
clerical-technical	.14	.02
skilled labor	.14	.35
semi-skilled labor	.59	.57
unskilled/unemployed	.14	.14
Occupational level of mother*		
administrative or minor professional	P≤.00	P≤.04
clerical-technical	.16	.12
skilled labor	.02	.00
semi-skilled labor	.31	.39
unskilled/unemployed	.48	.39
no current employment status	.03	.06

* A.D.C. and no-response are omitted; proportions do not total 1.00.

General educational attitude

A very few of the questions used to tap parents' general educational attitudes proved to differentiate between the Head Start and non-Head Start samples. The responsibility for education and child-teaching questions, and the item dealing with apprehensions about school, yielded no differences. In the area of willingness to give financial support, Head Start fathers were more likely ($P \leq .05$) to believe that all costs for education at the 12th grade level should be borne by the parents; in the area of sacrifices for the child's education, Head Start mothers were more willing ($P \leq .025$) to sacrifice for a child in the second year of college than were non-Head Start mothers. These two findings were balanced, however, by a substantial number of non-significant findings on the same variables at other educational levels.

Educational aspirations and expectations

T-tests were calculated for the four aspects of educational aspirations and expectations. Comparisons were made between experimental and control groups for both sexes and both socioeconomic groups. Two of these sixteen t-tests revealed significant differences between the groups: Head Start fathers of the upper-lower socioeconomic level had higher expectations ($P \leq .05$) for their child's optimal educational attainment ("if he does his very best"); Head Start mothers of the lower-lower socioeconomic level had higher ($P \leq .025$) personal aspirations ("if it were completely up to you) for their child. Again, however, it must be pointed out that these two are isolated findings, unconfirmed by other parallel analyses of the same variables.

Occupational and income aspirations and expectations

The results of these two analyses were similar to the results for educational aspirations and expectations; only a few isolated analyses gave evidence of differences between Head Start and non Head Start parents. A further analysis of occupational aspirations demonstrated that Head Start parents' happiness with various occupational levels was no different from that of the non Head Start parents.

Punishment and obedience

It was hypothesized that Head Start parents, enlightened by the child care aspects of Head Start's parent education program, would respond differently than would non Head Start parents to questions about the severity of their punishment for certain behaviors. Chi-square analyses of the responses to eighteen questions revealed no differences between the groups of parents in the severity of their punishing of the eighteen behaviors.

A related concept, the parent's expectations for the child's obedience, was also analyzed for differences between the Head Start and non Head Start parents. It was found, however, that although there were minor differences between the two groups in their views on (1) the importance of obedience, (2) the proportion of time that a child is expected to obey, and (3) the reasons the child should obey, the differences were not substantial.

Influence techniques

Possibly more revealing of parents' actual behavior than rating scales such as those used in studying punishment and obedience is the technique of asking for a report of actual behavior (although most desirable, of course, would be an actual sample of the behavior). Seven situations

were posed and parents responded with a report of the behavior they would exhibit in the situations described. In two of the seven situations posed, Head Start mothers gave different responses from those given by the non Head Start mothers. In instances where the child is seeking the mother's attention when she is busy, Head Start mothers tended to give the attention requested, while non Head Start mothers tended to respond with a directive or insistence (i.e. a rejection of the child's request). The second situation in which mothers' influence techniques differed was an episode in which the child should be sharing his toys with a playmate but refuses. In this situation Head Start mothers tended to include in their efforts to influence the child some reason, cushion, or both, for the required behavior, while the non Head Start mothers tended to assert their power without qualification in influencing the child toward desired behavior. These two results were in the hypothesized direction; no differences between the two groups were found in their responses to the five other influence situations.

Duties of parents and children

The parents were asked to rank the items on a list of duties which parents might be expected to perform toward their children. It was expected that Head Start parents would have a different view of their responsibilities toward their children from that of non Head Start parents; specifically it was hypothesized that Head Start parents' values would lie in such factors as education and freedom to develop potentialities rather than in more restrictive areas as surveillance, or provision of basic necessities. In two isolated instances the hypothesis was supported: (1) Head Start mothers were less likely than their non Head Start

counterparts to place emphasis on "watching over" the child; (2) Head Start fathers were more likely to emphasize providing an example for the child and preparing the child to be a good citizen. However, for the other "duties" the two groups were almost identical in their rankings. A list of duties of children toward their parents was also ranked by each parent; no differences were found in the responses of Head Start and non Head Start parents.

Discussion

It is quite clear from the results presented above that very few behavior and attitudinal differences between parents of kindergarten children who had participated in Head Start and parents of similar children with no preschool experience could be defined in this study. The few differences that were found were meaningful individually, but did not seem to follow any pattern.

It is surprising indeed to find in Head Start parents no differences in attitude toward educational matters. Head Start's endeavors in changing the parent's attitudes both toward his own child's education and toward the educational "establishment" would be expected to be manifest in his willingness to assume some responsibility for education and in his levels of aspiration for the child. However, it is clear from this study's results that we cannot say that Head Start has a measurable effect on the parent's attitudes toward education.

Childrearing patterns, also an important focus in Head Start parent programs, should undoubtedly give evidence of Head Start's family impact. Merely the act of sending a child off to Head Start classes is a behavior

modification, and hopefully the spirit would permeate other aspects of child-related behavior as well. However, such is not the evidence presented by these results.

The reasons for these consistently negative results might be searched and sorted through, but they must be attributed to one of two groups of causes: methodological and theoretical. The argument could be advanced that the variables in question do not provide an adequate methodological basis on which to judge the effects on parents of Head Start participation, or secondly the measurement of these variables could be criticized as inadequate. However, both of these arguments may successfully be rejected with the evidence that these are indeed the areas of chief concern in the parent program, and these measurements have served several research studies as useful tools for investigating the concepts of educational attitude and childrearing behavior.

Theoretically the results must be interpreted as refutation of the original hypothesis: that Head Start has an effect upon parents such that Head Start parents will exhibit different educational and childrearing attitudes and behaviors than will parents of similar circumstances who have had no contact with Head Start.

Conclusions

Appropriate next is the question of the meaning of these results to Head Start. Head Start has been widely acclaimed for its total-family orientation, for the wisdom of intervening in the family as a supplement to intervention with the child. The assumption has been that Head Start experience will change the parents, thereby influencing the child and improving his chances for success in contemporary society. However, the

evidence available from this study does not support the assumption. The implications of this problem for Head Start are at least two. First, it is clear that Head Start is making only part of the impact on the children that it could be making. Only the direct influence on the child, through the classes, is being made. By comparison the indirect influence, through the parents, is very small, far less than it could be and far less than the originators of Head Start intended that it be. Head Start's impact upon children can be increased substantially with an increased emphasis on the parent component.

Second, not only is the child not receiving what could be his, but the parent himself is not gaining from Head Start participation as he could be. The benefits of Head Start do not all accrue to the child; many parents benefit personally from the program in ways only remotely related to their children. It would seem that the results of this study, demonstrating as they do little or no impact of Head Start on parents in these selected areas, also demonstrate that the parents as well as the children are losing the chances that Head Start might provide them.

Postscript. -- A note on the theoretical assumptions underlying the study would be appropriate. If a post-hoc study such as this yields results showing differences between treatment and control groups, questions may always be raised as to the source of the differences. For the present study, two arguments could be advanced and supported: (1) One argument would suggest the existence of differences between parents who send their children to Head Start and parents who do not, supposing that the motivation for participation in Head Start would be associated with other characteristics such as attitudes toward educational matters and perhaps childrearing behavior. A study of this difference should be

conducted in the early stages of a Head Start program in order to avoid contamination of the treatment group by Head Start's parent program. In a post-hoc analysis such as the present study, differences between Head Start and non Head Start parents due to prior characteristics are not separable from differences due to the treatment. If the study is to focus on prior differences, it must assume no treatment effects. (2) Another equally plausible argument would assume that the fact of participation in Head Start is largely due to the recruiting efforts of Head Start personnel, and does not ascribe to the parents any special characteristics; differences between Head Start and non Head Start parents may then be attributed to the treatment, since the groups may be assumed equal at the outset. Either of these two positions could have been advanced as the basis for this study, and a rationale for either could have been developed. Considering the results of this study in the light of Head Start's purposes and program, it would seem most critical that both of these positions be explored and more specific answers be given regarding the interaction of parents and the Head Start program and the influence of both upon young children.

APPENDIX

VARIABLES, ITEMS, AND CODING KEYS

I. Education

General Educational Attitude

A. How do you feel the responsibility for teaching a child to read should be divided between the home and the school?

1. All home
2. Mostly home, some school
3. Half home, half school
4. Some home, mostly school
5. All school

B. What things would you do to help your child to read? (Free response)

1. Consulting expert sources
2. Help in recognizing symbols, in cognition and/or reading readiness activities, in reading stories or homework, or combination of these.
3. Reading stories or provision of materials without direct help, or both of these.
4. Combinations of 2 and 3.

C. If your child were just about to start kindergarten and acted as though he were afraid, what would you do? (Free response)

1. Reassurance, familiarization with the situation, explanation of the situation.
2. Leave child in school alone, stay with child in school, or shift responsibility to teacher or other.

D. Some people say that it's up to the family to bear the cost of their children's education. This might mean providing room, clothes, paying for tuition, and buying books. Others say it is up to the child to make his own way through school by earning money to pay for whatever it costs. In your opinion, how should the cost be divided when the child is in the 9th grade? 12th grade? Second year of college? Beyond four years of college?

1. All family
2. Mostly family, some child
3. Half family, half child
4. Some family, mostly child
5. All child

E. People have different ideas about how important it is to go to school. If you had to give up going to places like restaurants and movies; if you had to get along with less clothing and furniture; with an older car and an older house; if you had to do extra work like taking an extra job.....if you had to do things like that, how many things of that kind would you do in order to help your child finish junior high school? high school? two years more than high school? four years of college? continue going to school after four years of college?

1. All of them
2. Most of them
3. About half of them
4. Some of them
5. None of them

Educational Aspirations and Expectations

Now, I'd like to ask you some questions about school.

A. Thinking about your child, if he (she) does his (her) very best, how far do you think he(she) could go in school? (Response in terms of grade level.)

B. Now taking the other side of the picture, if he(she) doesn't do very well in school, how far do you think he(she) could go? (Response in terms of grade level.)

C. According to what you can tell now, how far do you think he(she) really will go in school? (Response in terms of grade level.)

D. Now tell me how far you would like to see him(her) go in school if it was completely up to you and you could have him(her) go as far in school as you wished? (Response in terms of grade level.)

Occupational Aspirations and Expectations

A. Now thinking about your child, if he(she) does his(her) very best, what job do you think he could have when he grows up? (Free response; coding key below.)

B. Taking the other side of the picture, if he(she) doesn't do very well, what job do you think he(she) might have when he(she) grows up? (Free response; coding key below.)

C. Now tell me what job you would like to see him(her) in when he(she) grows up if it were completely up to you and he could have whatever job you wished? (Free response; coding key below.)

1. Professional, managerial
2. Clerical, sales
3. Craftsman, operative
4. Service, laborer
5. No job, unemployed

D. What do you think the chances are of his(her) really getting to be (the answer given in the question above?)

Income Aspirations and Expectations

A. If your child were able to earn as much money as you wanted when he is grown up, how much money would you like him to earn each week? (Free response)

1. 100/week
2. 100-200/week
3. 201-300/week
4. 300/week

B. How much money do you really think he(she) will be earning each week when he(she) is grown up? (Free response, same code.)

II. Childrearing Patterns

Punishment

In which of the following situations do you feel that the child should be punished and in which should he not be punished? If he should be punished, how severe should the punishment be? (Coding key below)

1. Not finishing food at meals
2. Hitting brother or sister
3. Playing with electric light outlets
4. Talking instead of going to sleep
5. Tearing or losing clothes
6. Demanding attention
7. Saying dirty words
8. Scribbling on walls or in books
9. Throwing a temper tantrum or fit
10. Telling personal family matters
11. Romping in the car when traveling
12. Hitting his parents
13. Being sassy
14. Lying
15. Refusing to share toys
16. Stealing
17. Taking things apart around the house
18. Not doing homework.

Coding key:
0 Not punished at all
1 Very mild
2 Moderately mild
3 Average
4 Moderately severe
5 Very severe

Obedience

A. How important do you think it is that a child mind his parents?

1. Unimportant
2. A little important
3. Quite important
4. Very important
5. Very highly important

B. What proportion of the time can a child be expected to mind his parents?

1. None of the time
2. Some of the time
3. Half of the time
4. Most of the time
5. All of the time

C. What do you tell your child is the reason he should mind? (Free response)

1. Parent-centered response
2. Child-centered response
3. Family-centered response
4. Society-centered response

Influence Techniques (free response questions)

1. When I told my child he is not supposed to jump on the furniture in the living room, he began to scream and to hit me, so I said: (free response, coding key below)

2. My child had been playing alone for quite a while. Then he came over and said: "Mommy, (Dadd come play with me." I was busy at the time trying to get some things done. I told him I was busy and could not come right then. He left for a few minutes and then came back with the same request, so I said: (free response, coding key below)

3. We had my child's friend come over here one day. As soon as he started to play with one of my child's toys, he told him he could not touch or play with them. I went to my child and I said: (free response, coding key below)

4. Through the window I noticed my child was outdoors making something. Just as he was about to finish, a playmate of his about the same age as my child accidentally damaged it. From what I could see, I was sure it was an accident. By the time I got outside, my child was hitting and kicking at his playmate, who was crying. While there seemed to be no danger of either of them getting really hurt, I didn't think that my child was doing the right thing in hitting his playmate, so I said: (free response)

Coding key for 1-4:

1. Power assertions, unqualified
2. Power assertions, qualified with a reason, a cushion, or both
3. Technique offering choice of compliance, e.g. appeals, bargaining, suggestion
4. Non-intervention

5. The other day when I was doing some work around the house my child came home from school with a painting he wanted me to see, so I said: (free response)

Coding key:

1. Child-centered reply (immediate)
2. Parent-centered reply (postponement)

6. The last time we had a big thunderstorm my child watched the lightning through the window and later he asked me what made it thunder and lightning, so I said: (free response)

Coding key:

1. Supernatural explanation
2. Natural or physicalistic explanation

7. A friend down the street just died. My child knew him very well and was very fond of him. When he found out the man died, he asked what it was like to die, so I said:

Coding key:

1. Naturalistic
2. Religious, supernatural
3. Fatalistic
4. Reference to personal experience

Duties of Parents Toward Children

Here is a list of possible duties that parents might have toward their children. Let's read through them together, and you pick out the most important. (Read aloud while interviewee follows.) Which one is the most important duty parents have toward their children? (Repeat for second most important, etc.)

a. To PROVIDE food, clothing, and other needs.

b. To LOVE them and show them affection.

c. To help them get a good EDUCATION.

d. To be good FRIENDS with them and help them solve their problems.

e. To give them FREEDOM in certain areas as they develop their own personality.

f. To teach them RIGHT FROM WRONG and be a good EXAMPLE.

g. To WATCH over them so they don't get bad habits or get into trouble.

h. To PREPARE them to be active citizens, doing their part in society.

Duties of Children Toward Parents

Here's a list of possible duties that children might have toward their parents. Let's do the same as we did last time. (Repeat procedure outlined in previous question.)

a. To be OBEDIENT and respect their parents.

b. To be POLITE and have good manners.

c. To HELP their parents FINANCIALLY when they need help.

d. To LOVE and be INTERESTED in their parents when they are old.

e. To FOLLOW the EXAMPLE of their parents as good citizens.

f. To DO WELL in school and their jobs.